

REMARKS

Claims 1-66 are in the application. Claims 1-38 and 40-66 were rejected. Claim 39 was objected to but otherwise indicated as allowable. With respect to claim 39, the Examiner noted that the prior art does not teach or suggest invalidating a packet if the decision/result is not received by the time the end portion/last cell is received.

While Applicant submits that the prior art is distinguishable in various respects, in an effort to expedite prosecution Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 31 to incorporate the allowable subject matter as noted by the Examiner. Thus, with the independent claims amended to incorporate allowable subject matter, all claims should now be in condition for allowance, and such is respectfully requested.

Applicant also wishes to note that there four applications filed by Applicant based on the same product development efforts. These are:

<u>Ser. No.</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Examiner/Art Unit</u>
09/611,775	Pending	Jul. 7, 2000	Simitoski/2134
09/745,599	Pending	Dec. 21, 2000	Gold/2157
09/746,519	Pending	Dec. 21, 2000	Levitan/2662
09/746,107	Pending	Dec. 21, 2000	Luu/2141

Applicant has reviewed these applications and herewith is submitting an IDS that cross-cites the art from the other applications. The form 1449 includes all art cited in the four applications. For the convenience of the Examiner, on the form 1449 attached to the IDS all references previously considered in this application have been crossed-out (the 1449 reflects all prior art cited in the four applications).

Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Please charge any additional fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0251.

No new matter has been added.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan R. Loudermilk
Registration No. 32,788
Attorney for Applicant(s)

June 27, 2005
Loudermilk & Associates
P.O. Box 3607
Los Altos, CA 94024-0607
408-868-1516

*I hereby certify that this is being sent to the USPTO via
Fed Ex on the date indicated above.*

